

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT
Thurgood Marshall U.S. Courthouse 40 Foley Square, New York, NY 10007 Telephone: 212-857-8500

MOTION INFORMATION STATEMENT

Docket Number(s): 13-4850

Caption [use short title]

Motion for: Leave to file Amicus Brief

Kreisberg v. Healthbridge Management, LLC, et. al.

Set forth below precise, complete statement of relief sought:

Movant seeks leave to file brief on behalf of
proposed Amicus Curiae, New England Health
Care Employees Union, District 1199 SEIU, in
support of Appellee NLRB

MOVING PARTY: Proposed Amicus Curiae☐ Plaintiff☐ Defendant☐ Appellant/Petitioner☐ Appellee/RespondentOPPOSING PARTY: Healthbridge Mgmt et. al., AppelleesMOVING ATTORNEY: Elizabeth A. GrdinaOPPOSING ATTORNEY: Rosemary Alito, George Barbatsuly,

[name of attorney, with firm, address, phone number and e-mail]

Mooney, Green, Saindon, Murphy & WelchK&L Gates1920 L Street NW, Ste. 400, Washington, DC 20036One Newark Center, Tenth Floor, Newark, NJ 07102202-783-0010; bgrdina@mooneygreen.com973-848-4022; rosemary.alito@klgates.comCourt-Judge/Agency appealed from: U. S. District Court, District of Connecticut, Judge Chatigny

Please check appropriate boxes:

Has movant notified opposing counsel (required by Local Rule 27.1):



Yes



No (explain):

Opposing counsel's position on motion:



Unopposed



Opposed



Don't Know

Does opposing counsel intend to file a response:



Yes



No



Don't Know

**FOR EMERGENCY MOTIONS, MOTIONS FOR STAYS AND
 INJUNCTIONS PENDING APPEAL:**

Has request for relief been made below?



Yes



No

Has this relief been previously sought in this Court?



Yes



No

Requested return date and explanation of emergency:

Is oral argument on motion requested?



Yes



No

(requests for oral argument will not necessarily be granted)

Has argument date of appeal been set?



Yes



No

If yes, enter date: June 26, 2014

Signature of Moving Attorney:

/s/ Elizabeth A. GrdinaDate: 6/12/2014

Service by:



CM/ECF



Other [Attach proof of service]

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

JONATHAN B. KREISBERG, Regional Director
of Region 34 of the National Labor
Relations Board, for and on behalf of the
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS
BOARD

Plaintiff--Appellee,
v.

No. 13-4850

710 LONG RIDGE ROAD OPERATING
COMPANY II, LLC DBA LONG RIDGE OF
STAMFORD; 240 CHURCH STREET OPERATING
COMPANY II, LLC DBA NEWINGTON HEALTH
CARE CENTER; 1 BURR ROAD OPERATING
COMPANY II, LLC DBA WESTPORT HEALTHCARE
CENTER; 245 ORANGE AVENUE OPERATING
COMPANY II, LLC AKA WEST RIVER HEALTH
CARE CENTER; 341 JORDAN LANE OPERATING
COMPANY II LLC DBA WETHERSFIELD HEALTH
CARE CENTER,

Defendants,

HEALTHBRIDGE MANAGEMENT, LLC,
FKA DANBURY HCC,

Defendant -Appellant.

**MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAR AS *AMICUS CURIAE*
AND TO FILE ACCOMPANYING AMICUS BRIEF**

Pursuant to Fed. R. App. Proc. 29 (a), New England Health Care
Employees Union, District 1199, SEIU (“District 1199” or “the Union”),
respectfully moves this Court for leave to appear as *amicus curiae* and file the

accompanying Brief in Support of Plaintiff-Appellee, National Labor Relations Board, seeking to affirm the December 23, 2013 Order of the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut, the Honorable Robert N. Chatigny, holding Defendant-Appellant Healthbridge Management, LLC in contempt for its failure to comply with the requirements of the court's prior injunction.

District 1199¹ states its interest pursuant to Fed. R. App. 29(b)(1) as follows: The Union is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA or the Act), and is the certified exclusive collective bargaining representative of non-professional employees at the Defendants' long term care facilities in Connecticut ("Centers"), which are managed by Defendant-Appellant Healthbridge Management, LLC. ("Healthbridge"). The Union currently represents 700 employees at five of the Centers managed by Healthbridge. Prior to the disputes in this litigation, Defendants and the Union were parties to labor contracts at six Connecticut Centers in effect from December 31, 2004 to March 16, 2011. The district court determined Healthbridge was a joint employer with the Centers in this matter.

Pursuant to Fed. R. App. Proc. 29(b)(2), an amicus brief from the Union is

¹ Pursuant to Local Rule 29.1(b), no party to this proceeding has authored any portion of this brief or contributed money intended to fund this brief. No person, other than *amicus curiae*, contributed money that was intended to fund preparing or submitting this brief.

desirable and the matters asserted are relevant to the disposition of the case because the Union participated in the unfair labor practice proceedings before the NLRB in this matter, by initiating the unfair labor practice charges and assisting in the investigation of the charges.

Because of its participation in the underlying collective bargaining and other events at issue in the case, the Union has unique information or perspective that can help the court beyond the help that the lawyers for the parties are able to provide. Moreover, the Union is directly affected by the Defendant-Appellant's failure to comply with the district court's injunction, which required Healthbridge to offer reinstatement to the Union's seven hundred striking members, restore the previous wages, benefits, terms and conditions of employment that were in effect prior to June 16, 2012, and rescind all unilateral changes.

The Union thus has a stake in seeking the affirmance of the district court's order. "An amicus brief should normally be allowed... when the amicus has unique information or perspective that can help the court beyond the help that the lawyers for the parties are able to provide." *Scarlett v. United States Dep't of Homeland Sec. Bureau of Immigration & Customs Enforcement*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 40144, 2-3 (W.D.N.Y. May 12, 2009), quoting *Ryan v. Commodity Futures Trading Comm'n*, 125 F.3d 1062, 1063 (7th Cir. 1997). Moreover, courts routinely permit the Union to participate as *amicus curiae* in proceedings under §10(j) of the

NLRA. See, e.g., *Dunbar ex rel. NLRB v. Landis Plastics*, 996 F. Supp. 174, 179-180 (N.D.N.Y. 1998).

The Union was afforded *amicus* status and participated in the district court contempt proceedings below. [See Dist. Ct. ECF No. 66]. The Union was also granted the right to file an *amicus* brief in this Court during Defendants' appeal of the 10(j) injunction. *Kreisberg v. HealthBridge Mgmt., LLC*, 732 F.3d 131 (2d Cir. 2013) (2d Cir. Doc. No. 139).

Finally, this Motion is timely submitted pursuant to Fed. R. App. Proc. 29(e). The brief of the Appellee NLRB was filed on June 5, 2014, pursuant to this Court's briefing schedule.

A Declaration in Support of this Motion is attached hereto.

Dated: June 12, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Elizabeth A. Grdina
ELIZABETH GRDINA (DC Bar #450346)
Mooney, Green, Saindon, Murphy & Welch
1920 L Street N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 783-0010
Fax: (202) 783-6088
bgrdina@mooneygreen.com

/s/John M. Creane
JOHN M. CREANE, ct06081
Law Firm of John M. Creane
92 Cherry Street
Milford, CT 06460
(203) 878-2419
Fax: (203) 878-6021
JMCreane@gmail.com

Attorneys for Proposed Amicus Curiae
NEW ENGLAND HEALTH CARE
EMPLOYEES UNION, DISTRICT 1199, SEIU

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was electronically filed and served on the parties on June 12, 2014, via the Court's CM/ECF system, which will send notice of such filing to the following registered CM/ECF users:

Rosemary Alito
George P. Barbatsuly
K & L GATES LLP
One Newark Center, Tenth Floor
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Counsel for Appellant

Laura T. Vazquez, Esq.
DEPUTY ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL
Joel A. Heller
Elinor L. Merberg
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
1099 14th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20570

Counsel for Appellee

/s/Elizabeth A. Grdina
Counsel for Proposed *Amicus Curiae*
New England Health Care Employees
Union, District 1199, SEIU